REMARKS

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on March 23, 2006, this response replaces the response filed on January 25, 2006. We inadvertently omitted the word "each" in Claim 2 before the word "interconnected". We would like the word "each" deleted. We have corrected Claim 2 to show this amendment to the claim.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 9, 11 to 21, and 23 to 26 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 26, 29 and 33 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, a new title has been proposed, as required by the Office Action. Approval of the new title is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As shown above, these claims have been amended to claim a machine-readable medium, which Applicants contend constitutes an article of manufacture and, therefore, statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

All of the claims were rejected, either under §102 or §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,202 (Kleinberg). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater particularity. In view of these amendments, and the following remarks, withdrawal of the rejection over Kleinberg is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to an inferred relation weighting process for determining a strength of an inferred relation between a first Internet object and a second Internet object, where the first and second Internet objects are not directly linked. The process includes a first link weighting process for determining a first strength of a first link between the first

Internet object and a common object, a second link weighting process for determining a second strength of a second link between the second Internet object and the common object, and an inferred relation weight calculation process for calculating the strength of the inferred relation based on the first strength and the second strength. The first Internet object comprises a query for retrieving a document and the second Internet object comprises a document.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to calculating the strength of the inferred relation based on the first strength and the second strength, where the first Internet object comprises a query for retrieving a document and the second Internet object comprises a document.

More specifically, Kleinberg describes a process for establishing a neighborhood of common or interconnecting hyperlinks. The Kleinberg process includes identifying so-called authority pages and hub pages (Web pages), and refining sets of the authority and hub pages by finding other pages in the neighborhood that are linked to the authority and hub pages. Values are assigned to the hub and authority pages to indicate their relevance. Thus, the Kleinberg process involves identifying relationships among Web pages; it is not at all concerned with calculating the strength of an inferred relation between a query and a document (such as a Web page). In this regard, Kleinberg does mention queries in column 4, lines 34 to 43, as correctly noted in the Office Action. However, this mention of queries relates to identifying an initial set of pages (P) upon which the Kleinberg process is to be performed (see, e.g., column 7, lines 25 to 37). That is, in Kleinberg, an initial query is used to identify a set of pages, whereafter the

Kleinberg process is performed on those pages to identify related pages. But, as noted, Kleinberg does not calculate the strength of an inferred relation between a query and a document.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Kleinberg.

Amended independent claims 14, 26, 29 and 33 include limitations that are similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. These claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons noted above.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been addressed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

If any additional fees are due for this response or the accompanying information disclosure statement, please charge them to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 19084-540001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2006

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906